

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING D		ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/672,287	09/28/2000		Keiko Matsubara	40589/DBP/Y35	8798	
23363	7590	12/27/2002				
,		& HALE, LLP	EXAMINER			
350 WEST C SUITE 500	OLORAD	O BOULEVARD	YUAN, DAH WEI D			
PASADENA	.CA 9110	05			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	12
				1745	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, –
				DATE MAILED: 12/27/2002	DATE MAILED: 12/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action The MAILING DATE of this communication at THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2002 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to	LACE THIS APPLICATION IN o avoid abandonment of this a control timely filed amendment peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE application. A proper reply to a which places the application in	
The MAILING DATE of this communication at THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2002 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to	Examiner Dah-Wei D. Yuan Inppears on the cover sheet with LACE THIS APPLICATION IN It is a vioid abandonment of this a It is a timely filed amendment It is a vioid appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	Art Unit 1745 the c rrespondence address CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE application. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in	
The MAILING DATE of this communication at THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2002 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to	Dah-Wei D. Yuan Appears on the cover sheet with LACE THIS APPLICATION IN O avoid abandonment of this a (1) a timely filed amendment peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	1745 The c rrespondence address CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE application. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in	
THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2002 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to	ppears on the cover sheet with LACE THIS APPLICATION IN to avoid abandonment of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of this at the control of the contr	the c rrespondence address CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE application. A proper reply to a which places the application in	
THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2002 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to	LACE THIS APPLICATION IN o avoid abandonment of this a control timely filed amendment peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE application. A proper reply to a which places the application in	
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required t	o avoid abandonment of this a : (1) a timely filed amendmen peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	application. A proper reply to a which places the application in	
final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Ap Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	•	timely filed Request for Continued	
PERIOD FOR	RREPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date solving later than SIX MONTHS from the	mailing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the per fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration dat (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	iod of extension and the correspondi e of the shortened statutory period fo Office later than three months after	ng amount of the fee. The appropriate exterior reply originally set in the final Office action	tension on; or
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entere	d because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require fu	urther consideration and/or sea	arch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicationissues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canNOTE:	celing a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	jection(s):	·	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	n a separate, timely filed amendm	ent
5.⊠ The a)⊠ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)□ request application in condition for allowance because		considered but does NOT place the	he
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>9-11 and 13-15</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: 6.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,7 and 8.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)□ approved or b)□ o	lisapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	
10. Other:	PRIN	AND CHANEY MARY EXAMINER 12-26-02	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration and declaration filed on 12/17/02, respectively, are fully considered, but not persuasive. Ther term "agglomerate" is understood as "group of particles that are weakly bonded together via electrostatic, magnetic, Van der Waals, or capillary adhesion forces. Powder aggolomates are clearly evident in both Figures (b) (based on teaching of Goda reference) and (c) (based on example 1 in the current specification). Therefore, the recitation of "particle-aggolomerated product" does not provide patentable distinction over the Goda reference.